RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
MAY 11 2007

REMARKS

This response is being filed responsive to the Office Action dated January 11, 2007. For the following reasons, this application should be considered in condition for allowance and the case passed to issue.

The allowance of claims 9-11 and 15-16 is gratefully acknowledged.

Claims 1-2, 7-8, 13-14, and 17-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Aqueous Res: KK (hereinafter referred to as "'397"). Claims 4, 6, 12 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over '397 in view of Honda (hereinafter referred to as "'494"). Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over '397 in view of Nissan Diesel Motor Co. Ltd (hereinafter referred to as "'200"). The following is a comparison of the present invention as claimed with the '397, '200 and '494 references.

As recited in claim 1, for example, the embodiments of the present invention relate to an information providing device installed in a leader vehicle that leads a follower vehicle, for providing the follower vehicle with guidance prepared by the leader vehicle. The information providing device comprises a state detector configured to detect a state change in the leader vehicle to output a detecting signal, wherein the state change occurs in the vehicle when a driver of the vehicle provides an input to the vehicle. A guidance generator is configured to prepare, in response to the detecting signal, the guidance to guide the follower vehicle. This guidance includes a photographed image of a view ahead of the leader vehicle, and information of the state change overlaid on the photographed image.

In order to anticipate the claims of an application, the single prior art reference must identically disclose each and every element of the claimed invention. It is respectfully submitted

that '397 fails to satisfy this high burden. The '397 publication discloses a course guide device that is capable of providing a course guide so the course can be visually recognized by a picture. As the driver turns on an image pick up switch, the image pickup position is detected and the course image is picked up at a number of timed intervals. Once the follower vehicle reaches a certain position (X1), the course image can be successively reproduced and displayed on a display device, assuming that a display which is turned on or a side brake and a shift lever are set to neutral positions before the vehicle is stopped. When the vehicle arrives at a certain point (X3), the arrival of the vehicle at the position is reported to the driver in order to prompt the driver of the follower vehicle to select the course based upon the received course image.

As is clear from this Abstract, what is displayed to the driver of the follower vehicle is merely a course image that is successively reproduced on the display device. This is in sharp contrast to the claimed invention, which displays additional information overlaid on the photograph image. In claim 1, for example, a state detector configures a state change in the leader vehicle, this state change occurring when a driver of the vehicle provides an input to the vehicle. The information of the state change is overlaid on the photographed image. The Examiner has not asserted, nor does the Abstract of the '397 publication provide any indication, of an overlaid state change that is provided on the photographed image. For explanatory purposes, refer to Figure 5 of the present application for an example of an overlaid state change on a photographed image. The image 602 that is transmitted from the leader vehicle is displayed on the output in a 250 of the presenter 200 in the follower vehicle. The image 602 is an image that is ahead of the leader vehicle. Overlaid on this image 602 is an arrow mark 603 that is representative of a directional input to the turn signal of the leader vehicle based on detecting a state change. In this embodiment, the state change is the driver's turn signal operation. By

contrast, such an overlaid state change is not provided on the image described in the '397 publication.

One can readily recognize the advantages of providing the driver of the follower vehicle with information on the state change overlaid on the image. In a confusing intersection with many choices, such as the five road intersection depicted in the '397 publication, the overlaying of the state change provides the driver of the follower vehicle with improved information and direction to follow, instead of just a mere image.

Claims 13 and 14 contain similar limitations, of information of the state change overlaid on the photographed image. As the '397 publication can not be said to identically disclose these claims, it can not anticipate the claims under 35 U.S.C. §102 For these reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 13 and 14, as well as those claims dependent therefrom, are therefore respectfully requested.

Claim 8, also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102, describes a state detector coupled to a lamp switch that detects operation of the lamp switch installed in the leader vehicle and outputs a detecting signal. The guidance includes an image ahead of the leader vehicle that is photographed when the lamp is turned on. The Abstract of the '397 publication does not provide any indication of a state detector that is coupled to a lamp switch to detect operation of the lamp switch and output a detecting signal in the leader vehicle. Nor does the '397 publication Abstract describe an image ahead of the leader vehicle that is photographed when the lamp is turned on. Without such an identical disclosure, claim 8 can not be said to have been anticipated by the '397 publication. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 8 are respectfully requested.

Claim 3 was rejected based on the '397 and '200 publications as being obvious in light of these publications. Claim 3 depends from claim 2, which depend from claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that the '200 publication does not overcome any of the deficiencies noted with respect to the '397 patent in regards to independent claim 1 or dependent claim 2. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are respectfully requested.

Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based on the '397 publication. However, since claim 5 depends from impendent claim 1 that was rejected based on the '397 publication, claim 5 should also be considered allowable for at least the same reasons as provided above with respect to claim 1, since claim 5 further depends from and limits claim 1.

Claim 4, 6, 12 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based on the '397 and '494 publications. Of these, only claim 12 is independent. Claim 4 and 6 ultimately depend from claim 1, and should be considered allowable since the '494 publication fails to overcome any of the deficiencies noted in respect of the '397 publication. Therefore, even if combined with the '397 publication, the '397 publication and '494 publication do not overcome any of the deficiencies noted with respect to the '397 publication.

Claim 12 contains similar limitations as discussed above with respect to claim 1. In particular, a state detector is provided that is configured to detect a state change in the leader vehicle. The guidance includes a photographed image of a view ahead of a leader vehicle, and information of a state changes overlaid on the photographed image.

As with the discussion regarding claim 1, the '397 patent publication does not describe overlaying a state change information on a photographed image. The '494 publication discloses a peripheral information display device that specifies objects expected to influence the traveling

of one's vehicle and transmitting them to a driver by highlighting them on a picture image obtained from an image pickup means. Although the Examiner has alleged that the '494 publication discloses that the guidance generator obtains a position of the leader vehicle and running speed of the leader vehicle, this is not agreed to by the Applicant. The '494 publication merely discloses that a vehicle receives information from other vehicles which are driving around that vehicle. In other words, the information of the vehicle received is not that of the leader vehicle. The '494 publication discloses that the device displays objects expected to influence the traveling vehicle by highlighting them on a picture image, which is entirely different from the claimed invention which provides a photographed image of a view ahead of the leader vehicle and information of a state change that is overlaid on the photographed image. Accordingly, even if combined with the '397 publication, the combination would not make obvious claim 12 of the present invention. For similar reasons, claim 18, which depends from and further limits claim 12, should also be considered allowable over the combination of the '397 publication and the '494 publication.

For all of these reasons, the rejected claims should be considered in condition for allowance and such action is courteously solicited. If there are any questions regarding this response or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated to expedite the prosecution of the application.

10/808,478

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 502624 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

John A. Hankins
Registration No. 32,029

Please recognize our Customer No. 41552 as our correspondence address.

4370 La Jolla Village Drive, Suite 700
San Diego, CA 92122
Phone: 858.535.9001 JAH:tms
Facsimile: 858.597.1585
Date: May 11, 2007

SDO 64689-1.050195.0418